

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/778,172	02/07/2001	Akira Yabe	590146-2000	8328
20999 75	90 05/04/2004		EXAMINER FERRIS III, FRED O	
	AWRENCE & HAUG			
NEW YORK, 1	ENUE- 10TH FL. NY 10151		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			2128	. 1
		,	DATE MAILED: 05/04/2004	·

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

8

			\sim		
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	Q.		
	09/778,172	YABE, AKIRA			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Fred Ferris	2128			
The MAILING DATE of this communication apperiod for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet t	with the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perio - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	l. .136(a). In no event, however, may a eply within the statutory minimum of the d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO ate, cause the application to become	a reply be timely filed hirty (30) days will be considered timely. DNTHS from the mailing date of this communic ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	eation.		
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07</u>	February 2001.				
	is action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdreds 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	awn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examination The drawing(s) filed on 07 February 2001 is/a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Replacement of the second	are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ e drawing(s) be held in abeya ction is required if the drawin	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). ng(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.12	• •		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
a) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Ints have been received in lority documents have bee au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No In received in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)			
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/06 Paper No(s)/Mail Date S. Patent and Trademark Office		o(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 			

Art Unit: 2128

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-18 have been presented for examination based on applicant's disclosure filed 2 February 2001. Claims 1-18 have been rejected by the examiner.

Drawings

2. The formal drawing submitted on 2 February 2001 have been approved by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Specifically, independent claims 1, 15, and 17 recite limitations relating to "automatically adjusting" <u>a function</u> that are vague and indefinite since the language of the claim does not specify an automatic process, the specific elements, or the steps required for adjusting the first function to achieve the claimed second function <u>target</u> <u>value</u>, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

Further, the terms "<u>relatively high non-linearity</u>" and "<u>evaluation result</u>" in claims 1, 15, and 17 are relative terms that render the claim indefinite. The terms "relatively

Art Unit: 2128

high non-linearity" and "evaluation result" are not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a <u>standard for ascertaining the requisite degree</u>, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

Dependent claims inherit this defect.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 4. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,567,226 issued to Fuse.

Independent claims 1, 15 and 17 are is drawn to:

Method, Apparatus, and Code of optimizing (design) of an optical system by:

- Optimizing first optical property to a target value based on a first optimization function including an aberration (i.e. deviation/ abnormality)
- Adjusting first (optimization) function using second optical property target value based on an evaluation result
- Second optical property has high non-linearity compared to First
- Re-optimizing based on first (optimizing) function adjustment

Regarding independent claims 1, 15, and 17: Fuse discloses a method, apparatus, and computer code medium for optimizing the design of an optical system by optimizing optical properties (parameters) (CL21-L47) to a target value using an optimizing function (CL24-L59) that includes aberrations (CL31-L40-56). (A "target value" is merely a value of interest or a desired result in the optimization

Art Unit: 2128

process, in the case Fuse, a target value is a property objective, see: CL14-L25 for example) Fuse further discloses adjusting the optimization using multiple (first, second, etc.) sets of optical property values (CL16-L27-44, CL24-L64, Fig. 25), comparing the linearity (CL36-L64-CL37-L27) between sets (first, second, etc.) of optimized properties, and repeating (re-optimizing) the optimization process (CL24-L64). (Also see: Abstract, Background, Summary of Invention, CL29-L19-CL30-L65, CL49-L5, CL53-L34-47, Figs. 1-12, 26-42)

Regarding dependent claims 2-14, 16, and 18: Fuse further discloses optimization based on first and second evaluations (i.e. candidate answers, CL7-35-55, CL16-L27-39) effecting a first solution, weighted optical properties (CL14-L49, CL17-L45-65), sample object points (Fig. 19, Abstract, Background), sample rays (Figs. 18, 22), orthogonal coordinate components (CL34-L51-67), and modulation transfer function (MTF) properties including curvature and longitudinal aberrations (CL31-L40-56).

5. Claims 1, 15, and 17 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by "Fast Image-quality-based optimization of optical system", S. J. Dobson, Applied Optics, Vol. 37, No. 34, December 1998.

Regarding independent claims 1, 15, and 17: Dobson discloses techniques for optimizing the design of an optical system by optimizing optical properties

Art Unit: 2128

(parameters) (Section 1, 4) to a target value using an optimizing function (Section 2, 5) that includes aberrations (Section 3, 4, Tab. 1). (A "target value" is merely a value of interest or a desired result in the optimization process) Dobson further discloses adjusting the optimization using multiple (first, second, etc.) sets of optical property values (Section 2), comparing the linearity (Section 3-5) between sets (first, second, etc.) of optimized properties, and repeating (re-optimizing) the optimization process (Section 5).

Conclusion

- 6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- U.S. Patent 6,166,862 issued to Hashimura et al teaches optimizing the design of an optical system.
- U.S. Patent 5,067,067 issued to Estelle et al teaches optimizing the design of an optical system.
- U.S. Patent 5,786,940 issued to Robb teaches optimizing the design of an optical system.

"Design of a diluted aperture by use of the practical cutoff frequency", J.L. Flores, Applied Optics, Vol. 38, No. 38, December 1999 teaches optimizing the design of an optical system.

Art Unit: 2128

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fred Ferris whose telephone number is 703-305-9670 and whose normal working hours are 8:30am to 5:00pm Monday to Friday.

Any inquiry of a general nature relating to the status of this application should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

The Official Fax Numbers are:

April 20, 2004

Official

(703) 872-9306

Pred Perus. Patent Examiner
Simulation and Emulation, Art Unit 2128
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Crystal Park 2, Room 5D53
Crystal City, Virginia 22202
Phone: (703) 305 - 9670
FAX: (703) 305 - 7240
Fred.Ferris@uspto.gov

/

NO STATE OF THE PARTY OF THE PA